

JAN 19 2007

Appln. Serial No. 09/824,887  
Attorney Docket No. 42390P10580  
Reply to Final Office Action mailed on October 20, 2006

**REMARKS**

Claims 19-36 remain pending in the application, with claims 19, 31 and 34 being the independent claims. Independent claims 19, 31 and 34 and dependent claims 20, 21, 26, 32 and 33 are sought to be amended. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)***

Claims 19, 22-26, 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,191,800 (hereinafter referred to as "Arenburg"). Claims 20, 21, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Arenburg. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with respect to pending claims 19-34 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 19, 31 and 34 have been amended to include a similar feature of detecting whether there is a workload imbalance between the binner and renderer in the sequential rendering process; and in response to detecting the workload imbalance between the binner and the renderer, adjusting the size of the renderer to minimize the workload imbalance in the sequential rendering process.

**Appln. Serial No. 09/824,887**  
**Attorney Docket No. 42390P10580**  
**Reply to Final Office Action mailed on October 20, 2006**

Applicant respectfully asserts that Arenburg fails to teach or suggest this similar feature, as claimed. Arenburg is based on multiple concurrent rendering processes. In particular, the tiling approach in Arenburg treats these processes as symmetric and parallel. This is in contrast to the claimed invention which optimizes workloads from sequential (as opposed to parallel) workloads. Thus, for at least this reason, independent claims 19, 31 and 34 and their respective dependent claims 20-30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 are distinguishable from Arenburg. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § § 102(e) and 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Claims 27-30***

Examiner fails to mention claims 27-30 in the Detailed Action, but states that these claims are rejected in the Office Action Summary. Applicants respectfully requests clarification on the status of claims 27-30.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

01:55:26 p.m.

01-19-2007

12 /12

**JAN 19 2007****Appln. Serial No. 09/824,887****Attorney Docket No. 42390P10580****Reply to Final Office Action mailed on October 20, 2006****CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 19, 2007

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126

Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-0931

P10580 reply to final OA